

REMARKS

Applicant hereby traverses the outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in view of the remarks contained herein. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1–13 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,295,531 to Bae et al., (hereinafter *Bae*).

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P. § 2131. Furthermore, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim,” see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection does not satisfy these requirements.

Claim 1 requires, “receiving a query from a client; sending the query from the system core to a remote core over a communication network; and in response to the query, receiving from the remote core a message identifying a remote resource.” Claim 8 requires, a “system core computer program comprising computer instructions for . . . receiving a query from a client; sending the query to a remote core; and in response to the query, receiving from the remote core a message identifying a remote resource.” The Examiner cites to column 12, lines 5–35 and column 16, lines 1-23 of *Bae* as teaching these claim limitations. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited selections from *Bae* do not teach or suggest the claim limitations of claims 1 and 8.

The Examiner, in the section “Response to Arguments”, states that *Bae* discloses “sending a query from the system core (web server) to the remote core (database) as illustrated in figures 3, 4, 9 and 13”. The Examiner asserts that the resultant result (SQL script or HTML page) meets the recitation of a message identifying a remote resource because a typical URL path identifies a remote resource as is disclosed in column 12, lines 5-35.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contentions and conclusions regarding Bae. Specifically, Applicant disagrees that the URL of the database qualifies as identifying a remote resource as required by claims 1 and 8. With reference to the Examiner's contentions, it is clear that Bae requires that the user of the internet terminal specify the URL of the database the user wishes to query, or may retrieve a list of the available databases by specifying the Cool ICE URL. Column 12, lines 12-26. Bae further discloses that the user needs to identify and register databases. Column 15, lines 64-67. Specifically, the user needs to supply the TCP/IP address, database type, user-id, password, and logical name for the data source within Cool ICE.

It is clear in Bae that the user must specify the database which the user wants to query, therefore, the URL associated with the database searched is not new information to the user. The user of Bae is, therefore, not locating a remote resource as from claim 1, nor locating remote resources as in claim 8. Rather, the user has already specified the identity of the database to be searched, either by typing in the URL or by selecting it from a list. The return of the URL for that database, which has already entered by the user, cannot, as a result, be a message identifying a remote resource as suggested by the Examiner and claimed in claims 1 and 8. Therefore, Bae does not show every element in complete detail as is contained in claims 1 and 8.

Further, nothing in Bae suggests that the contents of the web page returned by the database of Bae are identifying a remote resource as required by claims 1 and 8. When an existing query definition is to be executed, the Cool ICE engine 428, which is essentially the Classic MAPPER database management system, runs the corresponding SQL script, thereby accessing the remote databases 422 and producing a report with the retrieved information. Col. 16, lines 37 – 49. That report is formatted within Web server 400 into an HTML page that is then transferred to the Internet workstation 396. Col. 16, lines 44 – 49. The report that is delivered to the Internet workstation 396 is a presentation of the results from the remote databases 422 in the form of a human-readable "report" constructed from the data residing in the database. Col. 16, lines 48 – 49, and col. 2, lines 11-19. As nothing in Bae suggests that the contents of the HTML page are identifying a remote resource, Bae does not teach each and every element of claims 1 and 8.

Finally, the Examiner has identified the web server of Bae as corresponding to the system core of claims 1 and 8 and has identified the database of Bae as corresponding to the remote core of claims 1 and 8. Again, claims 1 and 8 require receiving from the remote core a message identifying a remote resource. As described above, the Examiner has pointed to the URL path in Bae, which is the URL path of the database, as identifying a remote resource. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As the URL path is the URL path of the database, or remote core, it is not identifying a remote resource as set forth in claims 1 and 8. According to the Examiner's own analysis, the element being identified by the URL is the database (remote core) and not a remote resource. Therefore, Bae again does not teach each and every element of claims 1 and 8.

Dependent claims 2–7 and 9–13 each depend either directly or indirectly from base claims 1 and 8, respectfully, and, thus, inherit each and every limitation thereof. Therefore, because of their dependency, claims 2–7 and 9–13 teach limitations not disclosed or suggested by Bae. Applicants, thus, assert that claims 1–13 are patentable over the §102(e) rejections of record and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw same.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding the foregoing remarks he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10001279-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail Airbill No. EV482744383US, in an envelope addressed to:
MS AF, Commissioner for Patents,
PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,
on the date shown below.

Date of Deposit: March 18, 2005

Typed Name: Elise Perkins

Signature: Elise Perkins

Respectfully submitted,

By R. Ross Viguet
R. Ross Viguet
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 42,203

Date: March 18, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8185